UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/098,366	06/17/1998	NOBUYA HIGASHIYAMA	13237-2150	4032

27488 7590 09/22/2004

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C.
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER	
BASHORE, WILLIAM L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	38

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/098,366	HIGASHIYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William L. Bashore	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 June 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-11 and 13-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-11 and 13-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE and amendment, filed 6/18/2004 to the original application filed **6/17/1998**.

2. Claims 1, 3-21 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van De Vanter and Fukunaga.

3. Claims 22, 27-28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Multi-Edit.

4. Claims 23-26 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Multi-Edit, and WordPerfect.

5. Claims 1, 3-28 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 15, 21, 22 are independent claims.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

6. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/18/2004 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 1, 3-11, 13-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van De Vanter, U.S. Patent No. 5,857,212 issued January 1999, in view of Fukunaga, U.S. Patent No. 5,627,948 issued May 1997.**

In regard to independent claim 1, Van De Vanter teaches a location of a cursor over existing text (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67; compare with claim **1(a)** "*determining whether a location of a cursor in the electronic document is positioned over existing text*").

Van De Vanter teaches text editing by managing movement and placement of a cursor relative to text positions (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67, column 12 lines 22-29; compare with claim **1(b)** "*collecting context information regarding the location of the cursor in the electronic document by: if the location of the cursor is positioned over existing text, then collecting context information associated with the existing text*").

Van De Vanter does not specifically teach collecting said information proximate to cursor location (i.e. not positioned over existing text). However, Fukunaga teaches collecting contextual formatting information of text lines proximate to a cursor position not located over text (Fukunaga Figure 4, also column 3 lines 64-67, column 4 lines 1-10; compare with amended claim **1(b)** "*if the location of the cursor is not positioned over existing text, collecting context information associated with existing text that is proximate to the location of the cursor*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga's taught advantage of collecting format information, providing a way to establish format and display correspondence to Van De Vanter (Fukunaga column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

Van De Vanter teaches a rule selected from a plurality of rules subsequent to user input (Van De Vanter column 16 lines 65-67, column 17 lines 1-5; compare with amended claim **1(c)** "*selecting one of a plurality of rules based on the collected context information*").

Van De Vanter teaches changing cursor presentation (Van De Vanter column 36 lines 59-67; compare with amended claim **1(d)** "*in response to selecting the rule, changing a presentation of the cursor to indicate...* "). Van De Vanter does not specifically teach indication of formatting types in close proximity (i.e.

inserted at the cursor location). However, Fukunaga teaches display of formatting information proximate to cursor location, subsequent to a change in said cursor location (Fukunaga Figures 3, 4 items K, 301-307; compare with claim **1(d)** "*....the type of formatting that will be applied to text and objects inserted at the location of the cursor*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga's taught advantage of format change and display, providing a way to easily show formatting changes to Van De Vanter (Fukunaga column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

Van De Vanter teaches the use of cursor movement and placement management (Van De Vanter column 12 lines 22-29; compare with claim **1(e)** "*determining whether an indication has been received to place the insertion point in the electronic document*").

Van De Vanter teaches a method whereby a cursor is positioned in a displayed program for editing purposes (Van De Vanter column 12 lines 58-63). Van De Vanter does not specifically teach performing formatting. However, Fukunaga teaches performing formatting relative to cursor placement (Fukunaga Figures 3, 4 items K, 301-307; compare with claim **1(f)** "*if so, then performing formatting based on the selected rule to place the insertion point in the electronic document at the location of the cursor*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga's taught advantage of format change and display, providing a way to easily show formatting changes to Van De Vanter (Fukunaga column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

Additionally, it is noted that Van De Vanter teaches a method of alignment markers placed around tokens for centering lines, and automatic aligning between lines (Van De Vanter column 39 lines 9-23).

In regard to dependent claim 3, Van De Vanter teaches various types of mouse clicks that can be used in the embodiment of the invention as disclosed by Van De Vanter (Van De Vanter column 9 lines 42-44; compare with claim 3).

In regard to dependent claim 4, Van De Vanter does not specifically teach the repeating of steps 1(a) - 1(f) of amended claim 1 upon no indication of cursor placement. However, Van De Vanter teaches repeating the visual offset calculation of alignment markers (Van De Vanter abstract at bottom, also column 42 lines 54-57; compare with claim 4). Claim 4 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Van De Vanter, because of Van De Vanter's taught advantage of repetition, providing a way to display a complete formatting change to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In regard to dependent claim 5, Van De Vanter does not specifically teach a method of formatting comprising the addition/deletion of document formatting properties. However, Fukunaga teaches the changing of format properties (Fukunaga Figures 3, 4, also column 4 lines 8-10; compare with amended claim 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of Fukunaga to the method of Van De Vanter, because of Fukunaga's taught advantage of format changing, providing increased textual correctness to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In regard to dependent claim 6, Van De Vanter teaches localized lexical analysis performed subsequent to an insertion point defining a position of user editing, said position indicated by a cursor over text (Van De Vanter column 4 lines 25-33, column 21 lines 65-67; compare with amended claim 6).

In regard to dependent claims 7-8, Van De Vanter does not specifically teach associating a rule with formatting steps, as well as matching context information with a trigger, and selecting a coinciding rule. However, these limitations would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Van De Vanter, because Van De Vanter teaches how a keystroke executive and a tokenizer respond to a "delete net character" command issued by a user (Van De Vanter column 25 lines 44-50, and Table 6, 7). Certain positional rules are selected and implemented which are dependent upon a cursor position, which suggests triggering events and formatting steps eventually resulting in a final position (compare with claims 7-8), providing the advantage of rules based triggered events for modifying position displays.

In regard to dependent claim 9, a computer-readable medium (ie. diskette, hard disk, etc.) is known in the software art.

In regard to independent claim 10, claim 10 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Van De Vanter teaches a location of a cursor over existing text (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67; compare with claim **10(a)** "*determining whether a location of a cursor in the electronic document is positioned over existing text*").

Van De Vanter teaches text editing by managing movement and placement of a cursor relative to text positions (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67, column 12 lines 22-29; compare with claim **10(b)** "*collecting context information regarding the location of the cursor in the electronic document by: if the location of the cursor is positioned over existing text, then collecting context information associated with the existing text*").

Van De Vanter does not specifically teach collecting said information proximate to cursor location. However, Fukunaga teaches collecting contextual formatting information of text lines proximate to a cursor position not located over text (Fukunaga Figure 4, also column 3 lines 64-67, column 4 lines 1-10; compare with claim **10(b)** "*if the location of the cursor is not positioned over existing text, collecting context information associated with existing text that is proximate to the location of the cursor*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga's taught advantage of collecting format information, providing a way to establish format and display correspondence to Van De Vanter (Fukunaga column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

Van De Vanter teaches a rule selected from a plurality of rules subsequent to user input (Van De Vanter column 16 lines 65-67, column 17 lines 1-5; compare with claim **10(c)** "*applying the collected context information...*", and "*...to determine whether the collected information coincides with one of the plurality of rules*"). Van De Vanter also teaches the use of a database for storing lexical rules (see Van De Vanter column 11 lines 54-57; compare with claim **10(c)** "*...to a database of a plurality of rules...*").

In addition, Van De Vanter teaches a method of cursor selection and display based upon insertion point position resulting in different editing behaviors and cursor presentations (Van De Vanter column 36 lines 59-67, column 37 lines 1-2; compare with claim **10(d)** "*if so, then determining one of a plurality of cursors associated with the coinciding rule, wherein the cursor....at the location of the cursor*", and **10(e)** "*displaying the associated cursor....formatting indicated by the cursor*").

Additionally, it is noted that Van De Vanter teaches a method of alignment markers placed around tokens for centering lines, and automatic aligning between lines (Van De Vanter column 39 lines 9-23).

In regard to dependent claim 11, Van De Vanter teaches the presentation of an I-beam cursor based upon the position of an insertion point in the document (Van De Vanter column 37 lines 19-24; compare with claim 11).

In regard to dependent claim 13, Van De Vanter does not specifically teach the repeating of steps 10(a) - 10(e) of amended claim 10 upon movement of cursor placement. However, Van De Vanter teaches repeating the visual offset calculation of alignment markers (Van De Vanter abstract at bottom, also column 42 lines 54-57; compare with claim 13). Claim 13 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Van De Vanter, because of Van De Vanter's taught advantage of repetition, providing a way to display a complete formatting change to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In regard to dependent claim 14, claim 14 reflects the computer program product comprising computer readable instructions used for implementing the methods as claimed in claim 13, and is rejected using the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 15, claim 15 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 10, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Van De Vanter teaches a location of a cursor over existing text (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67; compare with claim **15(a)** "*determining whether a location of a cursor in the electronic document is positioned over existing text*").

Van De Vanter teaches text editing by managing movement and placement of a cursor relative to text positions (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67, column 12 lines 22-29; compare with claim **15(b)** "*collecting context information regarding the location of the cursor in the electronic document by: if the location of the cursor is positioned over existing text, then collecting context information associated with the existing text*").

Van De Vanter does not specifically teach collecting said information proximate to cursor location. However, Fukunaga teaches collecting contextual formatting information of text lines proximate to a cursor position not located over text (Fukunaga Figure 4, also column 3 lines 64-67, column 4 lines 1-10; compare with claim **15(b)** "*if the location of the cursor is not positioned over existing text, collecting context information associated with existing text that is proximate to the location of the cursor*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga's taught advantage of collecting format information, providing a way to establish format and display correspondence to Van De Vanter (Fukunaga column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

Van De Vanter teaches a rule selected from a plurality of rules subsequent to user input (Van De Vanter column 16 lines 65-67, column 17 lines 1-5; compare with claim **15(c)** "*applying the collected context information...*", and "*...to determine whether the collected information coincides with one of the plurality of rules*"). Van De Vanter also teaches the use of a database for storing lexical rules (Van De Vanter column 11 lines 54-57; compare with claim **15(c)** "*...to a database of a plurality of rules...*").

In addition, Van De Vanter teaches a method of matching an I-beam cursor relevant to various insertion point positions (Van De Vanter column 36 lines 64-67, column 37 lines 1-3; compare with claim **15(d)** "*if so, then adjusting the location of the insertion point to the location of the cursor based upon the coinciding rule*", and **15(e)** "*displaying the cursor.... the insertion point.*").

Additionally, it is noted that Van De Vanter teaches a method of alignment markers placed around tokens for centering lines, and automatic aligning between lines (Van De Vanter column 39 lines 9-23).

In regard to dependent claims 16, claim 16 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 8, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 17-18, Van De Vanter teaches an embodiment involving secondary memory (Van De Vanter column 8 lines 25-29; compare with claim 17). A computer-readable medium (ie. diskette, hard disk, etc.) is known in the software art (compare with claim 18).

In regard to dependent claim 19, Van De Vanter teaches a method of a token stream, whereby dynamic user input results in updating insertion points and cursor positions of each dynamic editing action which can be used with a mouse (Van De Vanter column 4 lines 25-35, column 9 lines 42-44; compare with claim 19).

In regard to dependent claim 20, Van De Vanter teaches a method of an insertion point defining an actual editing location, said cursor location and analysis is updated subsequent to a user edit (Van De Vanter column 4 lines 25-35; compare with claim 20).

In regard to independent claim 21, claim 21 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 15, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Van De Vanter teaches a location of a cursor over existing text (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67; compare with claim **21(a)** "*determining whether a location of a cursor in the electronic document is positioned over an existing line*").

Van De Vanter teaches text editing by managing movement and placement of a cursor relative to text positions (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67, column 12 lines 22-29; compare with claim **21(b)** "*collecting*

context information regarding the location of the cursor in the electronic document by: if the location of the cursor is positioned over an existing line, then collecting context information associated with the existing line").

Van De Vanter does not specifically teach collecting said information proximate to cursor location. However, Fukunaga teaches collecting contextual formatting information of text lines proximate to a cursor position not located over text (Fukunaga Figure 4, also column 3 lines 64-67, column 4 lines 1-10; compare with claim **21(b)** "*if the location of the cursor is not positioned over the existing line, collecting context information associated with an existing line that is proximate to the location of the cursor*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga's taught advantage of collecting format information, providing a way to establish format and display correspondence to Van De Vanter (Fukunaga column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

Van De Vanter teaches a rule selected from a plurality of rules subsequent to user input (Van De Vanter column 16 lines 65-67, column 17 lines 1-5; compare with claim **21(c)** "*selecting one of a plurality of rules based on the collected context information*").

Van De Vanter teaches changing cursor presentation (Van De Vanter column 36 lines 59-67; compare with claim **21(d)** "*in response to selecting the rule, changing a presentation of the cursor to indicate...*"). Van De Vanter does not specifically teach indication of formatting types in close proximity. However, Fukunaga teaches display of formatting information proximate to cursor location, subsequent to a change in said cursor location (Fukunaga Figures 3, 4 items K, 301-307; compare with claim **21(d)** "*...the type of formatting that will be applied to text and objects inserted at the location of the cursor*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga's taught advantage of format change and display, providing a way to easily show formatting changes to Van De Vanter (Fukunaga column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

Van De Vanter teaches the use of cursor movement and placement management (Van De Vanter column 12 lines 22-29; compare with claim **21(e)** "*determining whether an indication has been received to place the insertion point in the electronic document*").

Van De Vanter teaches a method whereby a cursor is positioned in a displayed program for editing purposes (Van De Vanter column 12 lines 58-63). Van De Vanter does not specifically teach performing formatting. However, Fukunaga teaches performing formatting relative to cursor placement (Fukunaga Figures 3, 4 items K, 301-307; compare with claim **21(f)** "*if so, then performing formatting based on the selected rule to place the insertion point in the electronic document at the location of the cursor*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga's taught advantage of format change and display, providing a way to easily show formatting changes to Van De Vanter (Fukunaga column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

Additionally, it is noted that Van De Vanter teaches a method of alignment markers placed around tokens for centering lines, and automatic aligning between lines (Van De Vanter column 39 lines 9-23).

9. **Claims 22, 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Multi-Edit Text Editor Version 8.0 (hereinafter Multi-Edit), April 29, 1998 by American Cybernetics, application screenshots pp. 1-10.**

In regard to independent claim 22, Multi-Edit teaches an electronic text editor (Multi-Edit page 2; compare with claim 22 "*A computer-implemented method for editing an electronic document comprising:*").

Multi-Edit teaches a cursor (vertical line) placed in a document via keyboard keys and/or via mouse (Multi-Edit page 10). Since Multi-Edit is a text processor, it is implied that said cursor is positioned to accept alphanumeric text adhering to formatting specific to said text (i.e. since typical text editors contain a default font type and size, Multi-Edit is set to accept default font formatting accordingly) (compare with claim 22 "*displaying a cursor at a location in the electronic document....inserted at the cursor location;*").

The limitation of receiving notification of an intent to create an insertion point would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, because Multi-Edit teaches a "Restrict cursor" option (Multi-Edit page 3). Unchecking said option results in an unrestricted cursor, so that a user can place said cursor (using typical arrow keys, and/or mouse movement) to any part of a document (both before or after an

>>EOF<< (end of file) indication) (Multi-Edit pages 4-5). A user triggers an insertion point subsequent to pressing <ENTER> or typing letters (Multi-Edit page 6-8), providing reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan of notifying Multi-Edit that a user wants to create an insertion point at any location in a document (i.e. in areas without existing text) (compare with claim 22 "*receiving notification of an intent to create an insertion point at the cursor location;*"), providing a user of Multi-Edit the benefit of planning layout of a cursor position prior to creating an insertion point.

Multi-Edit teaches automatically reformatting a document by shifting the >>EOF<< document marker so that it is proximate to a new insertion point, said insertion point previously over an area without text (Multi-Edit pages 5-8; compare with claim 22 "*if the cursor location....at the cursor location.*").

In regard to dependent claims 27-28, Multi-Edit teaches a graphical representation of a document showing areas before and after an >>EOF<< marker in a document (Multi-Edit page 7-8)

10. **Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Multi-Edit Text Editor Version 8.0, April 29, 1998 by American Cybernetics, application screenshots pp. 1-8, in view of WordPerfect for Windows version 6.1 (hereinafter WordPerfect), released 4/15/1996 by Corel Corporation, screenshots from application, pp. 1-10.**

In regard to dependent claims 23-26, Multi-Edit does not specifically teach adding paragraph and other marks vertical and horizontal, as well as context information. However, WordPerfect teaches formatting adjustments for including text and text markers, as well as context information (i.e. new tab, paragraph, and space markers) proximate to (i.e. horizontal and vertical) an input cursor, in the present case, blank2.txt (WordPerfect pp. 8-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply WordPerfect to Multi-Edit, providing Multi-Edit the benefit of various contextual markers for better planning layout of a document.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 6/18/2004 have been fully and carefully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on page 8 of the amendment that Van De Vanter does not teach the claimed limitations of representative claim 1 (in particular "*changing a presentation of the cursor....based on the selected rule to place the insertion point in the electronic document at the location of the cursor*"as claimed). It is respectfully noted that Van De Vanter's I-beam can vary the top and bottom (horizontal) parts of said I-beam to reflect size of the visual whitespace gap in which it is positioned, along with various context (Van De Vanter column 36 lines 59-67 to column 37 lines 1-35). The changing of shape and presentation can coincide with commands of the editor (i.e. not responding when a user strikes a spacebar, and cursor blinking – see Van De Vanter column 37 lines 24-28).

Please note that Van De Vanter column 36 lines 59-67 states in pertinent part "...the insertion point can appear in six different contexts, which are indexed and described in Table 3. Since each of these insertion positions may produce different editing behavior (refer to preceding Tables 4-8), the TDP modifies the basic cursor I-beam shape to differentiate the various insertion points. In the preferred embodiment, the TDP 170 varies the top and bottom (horizontal) parts of the I-beam to reflect size of the visual whitespace gap in which it is positioned." (underlining added).

Van De Vanter continues on column 37 lines 1-27 further explaining said differentiation. The I-beam cursor changes shape to reflect the amount of whitespace gap (positions 1, 3, 4). If the gap is wide, the horizontal bars of the I-beam will span the entire whitespace length. This signals the user the type of formatting that will be applied; if the delete key is pressed, the entire whitespace area (as defined by the I-beam length) will be affected (see Van De Vanter column 37 lines 14-19).

Additionally, a cursor in position 5, 6, and 4 will darken or brighten to indicate presence of provisional separators. The blinking of the cursor in positions 5, 6, and 4 signals the user of what will happen (the editor will not respond, and no formatting is to be applied) (see Van De Vanter column 37 lines 19-27).

Van De Vanter changes the presentation of a cursor for the purpose of letting the user know the present formatting situation, and (as explained above, as well as Van De Vanter column 37 lines 28-31) signaling to the user what the system will do pending certain key press operations (i.e. delete key press, etc.).

It is respectfully noted that Van De Vanter's specialized actions and cursor presentations can be fairly interpreted as based upon selection of a set of "rules". Since Van De Vanter teaches "rules" as explained in the rejection of claim 1, the cursor's behavior is at least dependent upon said rules. Therefore, said cursor follows the rule of changing shape accordingly when positioned as explained above.

Fukunaga teaches performing formatting relative to cursor placement, as necessary (see Fukunaga Figures 3, 4 items K, 301-307).

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William L. Bashore whose telephone number is (703) 308-5807. The examiner can normally be reached on 11:30am - 8:00pm EST. During the month of October 2004, the examiner's telephone number will transition to **(571) 272-4088**.

13. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. During the month of October 2004, the supervisor's telephone number will transition to **(571) 272-4090**.

14. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

William L. Bashore

William L. Bashore
Patent Examiner AU 2176
September 19, 2004